

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-26 and 28-44 are pending in the present application. No claims are amended, canceled, or added by the present response.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 17-21, 39, 40-41, and 43-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Gomez (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,221); and Claims 22-38 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gomez in view of Moore (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,846), both rejections being respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 17 is directed to a redundant routing system, that includes a first routing unit, a second routing unit, a network interface, and a standby interface. Both the first and second routing units are configured to manage input and output data. The network interface connects the first and second routing units. The second routing unit is configured to detect a failure of the first routing unit by monitoring both the network and standby interfaces using messages sent over both the network and the standby interfaces. When the second routing unit detects the failure of the first routing unit, the second routing unit deactivates the first routing unit so that the first routing unit no longer manages input and output data and the second routing unit starts managing the input and output data. Independent Claim 39 recites similar features as Claim 17.

In a non-limiting example, Figure 2 shows the first routing unit 1, the second routing unit 3, the network interface 23, and the standby bus interface 24.

The claimed redundant routing system advantageously relies on the standby routing unit (the second routing unit) to detect the failure of the master routing unit (first routing unit) and to deactivate the master routing unit so that the master routing unit no longer manages the

input and output data. In other words, the standby routing unit does not rely on external devices for detecting the failure and deactivating the master routing unit.

Turning to the applied art, Gomez shows in Figure 2 a fault tolerant dial router that includes a first card 46A and a second card 46B that manage input data received along lines 17 and 37 and output data to a network 32. The first card 46A is identical to the second card 46B and when the first card 46A fails, the standby card 46B replaces the failed card 46A.

However, Gomez discloses with reference to Figure 6 (see col. 5, line 64, to col. 6, line 3) that when a failure is detected in the line interface 20A of the first card, a processor 42A of the first card 46A reports the fault to a controller 28 and the “controller 28 in step 74 deactivates the active feature card 46A and activates the standby feature card 46B.”

In other words, the second card 46B in Gomez does not detect a failure of the first card 46A as required by independent Claims 17 and 39. To the contrary, the processor 42A of the first card 46A detects the fault and reports that fault to an external third unit, router/controller 28.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that based on the fault detected in the first card 46A, the router/controller 28, which is not part of the second card 46B, decides to replace the first card 46A with the second card 46B. On the contrary, independent Claims 17 and 39 recite that “when said second routing unit detects a failure of said first routing unit, said second routing unit is configured to deactivate said first routing unit.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Gomez does not teach or suggest that (i) a second routing unit detects a failure of the first routing unit, and (ii) the second routing unit deactivates the first routing unit as required by independent Claims 17 and 39.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 17 and 39 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Gomez.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Moore for teaching a change in an impedance of at least one input/output serial port. However, Moore does not cure the deficiencies of Gomez discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 17 and 39 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Gomez and Moore, either alone or in combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06)

PJS/RFF:sjh

I:\ATTY\RFF\20S\206483\206483US-AM.DOC

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.

Registration No. 59,140